SUPREME COURT, U. S

FILED
MAR 7 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE

UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

SUPPLEMENT TO NO. 74-916

ANTHONY J. RADISICH
Petitioner

v

SONJA J. RADISICH

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

Anthony J. Radisich

574 El Camino Real
Mountain View, Calif.94040
(415-967-7889)
PERSONA PROPRIA

SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION 74-916

May an appellate court absolve the errors of the trial court without consideration of Citizen's Justice and the Appellant-Petitioner's Constitutional Rights? Refering to page 24 quoting the Appellate court, "Viewing the record most strongly in favor of judgment, as we must, the "AS WE MUST" is a far departure from the understanding the Citizen has as regarding equal opportunity for Justice rather than cover up for errors of judicial proceedings; it incarcerates the Citizen's Liberty to an insistant obedience to the trial court's errors. Petitioner pleads, with a prayer to Almighty God and the U.S Supreme Court to exercise the Court's power of supervision for the betterment of Our Country by granting a Writ of Certiorari.

May a court Constitutionally refuse

to accept facts presented? Additionally the appellate court states, "the pertinent facts are as follows" on page 24, "He lived in the U.S. for a number of years and returned to Yugoslavia to claim a bride," is one of literally hundreds of items of perjury and misleadings of the trial and appellate courts accepted by them; attached is Petitioner's birth certificate as proof.

May the appellate court give authorization, endorsement and approval to the trial court in depriving Petitioner of his property, of depriving of equal protection of the laws against fraud, theft, transmutations of property titles, conspiracy, deceit, unjust enrichment, connivance, perjury and collusion?

Since the trial and appellate court have admittedly decided an important question of Fedral Law, that is that Our

CITY OF BELLINGHAM DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Vital Statistics Bellingham, Washington

Transcript of Information Appearing on a

Birth Certificate

Duly Filed and Registered in the Office of the City Comptroller

Name *Sex*

Date of Birth , 19 , *Place of birth* , *Washington*

Name of father *Age*

Birthplace of father

Maiden name of mother *Age*

Birthplace of mother

Date filed , 19 *By*

Attendant.

ANY CHANGE OR ERASURE VOIDS THIS CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the facts given above are a true part of a record on file in the Office of the City Comptroller, Bellingham, Wash., a copy of which is also on file in the Section of Public Health Statistics, Washington State Department of Health, Seattle, Washington.

Issued at Bellingham, Washington,

on , 19

Alfred B. Leep

City Comptroller.

Certificate No. *By*

Deputy.

Constitutional Amendments have no stance within the California Family Law Act of 1 January 1970, this important question of Federal Law desperately important to the future of Our Country, no less important than such questions as oil drilling off shore, which has not been, should be settled by the Honorable U.S.Supreme Courtfor even with abundance of oil Americans without Justice could notbe free.

Appellate court on page 37 stating, "The new act repealed the former specific grounds for divorce that included adultry and requires an equal division of communi ty property, regardless of the conduct of the parties," would insist that we accept what the Calif. Family Law Act negates which is the equal treatment of the equal protection of the law under Our V and XIV Amendments as guranteed in Our U.S. Constitution.

Does Our U.S. Constitution allow for a double standard of protection under the law, one for divorce and another for other situations?

Since the trial and appellate courts appear to condone spousalcriminal acts, indicating that the Calif. Family Law Act supercedes Our U.S.Constitution, is this type of crime, protected under the Calif. Family Law Act, Constitutional?

Indications are that Sonja and her paramour, now commonlaw husband, both of whom despise and detest the United States, as early as 1967-68 laid plans to fleece this American for the political reason to help a state in Europe secede from its country and in August 1969 she, while in Europe confided to a subsequent witness that, "She was waiting only for the Calif. Legislature to pass the new Family Law

Act and then she would strike and be awarded large sums of money and would not be held accountable for anything," knowing by this admission that she had violated the laws of the State of California as well as the laws of the United States, yet the trial and appellate courts did not concern themselves with this evidence chances are because of the unconstitutional Calif. Family Law Act's clause, "regardless of the conduct of the parties."

Is the discrimination against the male, the father-Citizen-humanbeing, as to the abridging of his Civil and Personal Rights and the taking of his property permitted by Our U.S. Constitution?

Attorneys refused to file the petition on the grounds that the Honorable U.S. Supreme Court has no interest and has not heard this type of case since

Williams and Williams and that it may be considered not important enough - Our Nation is already top heavy with untruths, can anyone conceive of anything more important than defending the Constitutional Rights, the Personal Rights and the Property Rights of the man, the Citizen of Our United States? That which we sorely need is to rejuvenate and revitalize the patriotic being in Our Society; a unity we desperately need, can anyone turn their back on their fellow man? It is estimated in California that 300,000 males are not complying with the Interlocutory Decree of the trial court, Appellant-Petitioner does not condone this, and that Sheriff's Deputys have made contact with an estimated 26,000. If in the minds of these men there was a sense of being able to receive equal protection under the law or that they had

another avenue of Justice available to them, there certainly would be a considerable lessor amount of violators; don't you agree?

May the trial court and the appellate court enforce paragraph 4800 of the statute which has violated the XIV and V Amendments of Our U.S.Constitution by denying Citizen-Respondent-Fathers the equal protection of the laws, denied the Civil Rights and Personal Rights and had taken away the male's separate property?

California Family Law Act Title 6 Property Rights of the Parties paragraph 4800 is repungnant to Our Constitution as it envelopes and subdues a minority of male Citizens into a worth less status as it does not permit Constitutional protection against criminal and civil abuse of the innocent-respondent-father by his spouse, it does not protect him from the taking

of his property and it does conversely encourage woman to do just that; scheme to obtain unjust enrichment; at the expense of Our Country.

In the words of the members of the Divorced Fathers and Second Wives Society To a man deflated of his Constitutional and Personal Rights and deprived of his property "Life becomes worthless and a Citizen is worthless when Our Own Government allows this vidious discrimination to flourish."

Appellant-Petitioner respectfully submits the foregoing to additionally aide the Honorable U.S.Supreme Court to issue the Writ of Certiorari.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct executed this 27 Day of February 1975 at Mountain View, California Anthony J. Rodriguez

Persona Propria
Enclosed birthcertificate

LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAR 13 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE

UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

CASE NO. 74-916

ANTHONY J. RADISICH
Petitioner

V

SONJA J. RADISICH

MOTION TO STAY ALL PROCEEDINGS

PENDING DECISION WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Anthony J. Radisich

574 El Camino Real
Mountain View, California 94040
(415-967-7889)
PERSONA PROPRIA

MOTION TO THE HONORABLE U.S.SUPREME COURT: TO STAY ALL PROCEEDINGS PENDING DECISION WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

Appellant-Petitioner finds his position, his property and life in jeopardy, as well as that of his wife and child, as the counsel for Respondent (other party) after having received three copies of Petition 74-916 filed a motion with the Superior Court of Santa Clara County California to liquidate the property, one of the very subjects of the Petition, a maneuver which would serve, if not checked, to errode the very preciousness, "the equal protection of the laws," of Our XLV Amendment, thus to put Appellant in an inextricable irreparable situation unprotected by Our Constitutional Law until the Honorable U.S. Supreme Court issues Stay Of All Proceedings Pending Out Come Of Writ Of Certiorari. Appellant-Petit-

ioner respectfully moves the Honorable U.S.Supreme Court for a Stay Of All Proceedings In The Lower Courts Pending The Out Come Of The Writ Of Certiorari and DECLARES: Appellant-Petitioner has properly pursued the matter from the trial court through the appellate court and is now in the the U.S.Supreme Court with a timely filed petition 74-916 with supplement and conformed to rule 33. It is this layman's opinion that the jurisdiction lies with the Honorable U.S.Supreme Court and not with the Superior Court and that Other-Party-Respondent's motion (lead page typ-od herein) in lower court, is out of order until such time as a review is had of the obstruction of Justice of the past five years in this case matter if they prevail.

Rumor here has it and attorneys are betting that the Superior Court will take no heed that a layman has filed with the U.S. Supreme Court and will agree to sell

Nevo F. Capitina
361 Castro St.
Mountain View, Calif, 94040
Telephone 967-6904
(Respondent)
Attorney for Petitioner (other party)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

In re marriage of	
Petitioner: Sonja J. Radisich	
and	P 17281
Respondent: Anthony J. Radisich	NOTICE

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AGAINST SURETIES ON APPEAL BOND & FOR RESPONDENT (Appellant-Petitioner) TO PLACE PROPERTIES FOR SALE

TO: ANTHONY J. RADISICH, Respondent and to his attorney, ALFRED P. CHASUK and to THERESA F. RADISICH, JERRY RADISICH AND CORNELIA R. RADISICH:

YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on Friday, March 21, 1975, at 9:00 A.M. of said day, or as soon thereafter as coun-

sel can be heard, at the courtroom of the Presiding Judge of the above-entitled Court, at the courthouse at 270 Grant Avenue, Palo Alto, California, petitioner named-above will move the Court for judgment in the amount of one-half ----------

3 pages and declaration.

continued from page 2

ing of the property even though no jurisdiction over the U.S.Supreme Court's jurisdiction. 90 year old Jerry Radisich, Appellant-Petitioner's father, feels, can a lower court over ride the U.S.Supreme Court, mockery would be made of the Inalienable, Constitutional and Personal Rights of the American Citizen, should this happen, we would humbly bow are heads in shame that such divorce of Justice could exist in Our Country. I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct executed this 9 Day of March 1975 at Mountain View, California.

Anthony J. Radisich